

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2 and 4-19 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended.

Claim 3 was cancelled previously.

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is respectfully traversed. Claims 1 and 8, and hence their dependent claims, have been amended to make it clear what is being claimed. In particular, the claims have been amended to make it clear that the scheduler prioritizes the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on the demand for the class and available resources. This amendment serves two purposes:

One, it serves to avoid the 35 U.S.C. 112 objection; and two, it serves to better avoid the Poliquin et al (US 5,696,486) art.

Note that the limitation restricts the scheduler to definite features of prioritizing in the manner it sets forth in applicant's last response.

The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 - 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Poliquin et al (US 5,696,486) (hereinafter Poliquin) is respectfully traversed. Poliquin failed to disclose "prioritizing the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on demand for the class and available resources" which is not in Poliquin. In paragraph 4 of the "Response to Arguments" the Examiner contended that "Applicant did not claim prioritization of the evaluation of policy equivalency classes based on demand for the class and available resources." The claims have been amended to include this feature. This is supported by applicant's disclosure of a scheduler 222 to determine the order in which non-triggering conditions are to be evaluated. The scheduler prioritizes the evaluation of the policy. Clearly, class is based on demand for the class and available resources. Figure 2


illustrates the scheduler in the policy decision point PPD (220). If multiple PDPs are used, the scheduler is shared by all PDPs and may be more appropriately collocated with the policy database 250. See applicant's previous response, page 9.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully submits the claims are patentable over the art; and further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

A Request for Continued Examination is being filed concurrently herewith.

This is a request under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) to extend the period for filing a reply in the above-identified application for a two-month period. The extension fee in the amount of \$460.00 is included in the attached check.

Respectfully submitted,



Jim Zegeer, Reg. No. 18,957
Attorney for Applicant

Attachment: RCE Transmittal

Suite 108
801 North Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone: 703-684-8333

Date: January 30, 2008

In the event this paper is deemed not timely filed, the applicant hereby petitions for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension may be charged to Deposit Account No. 26-0090 along with any other additional fees which may be required with respect to this paper.